

PATENT  
450100-03060.1

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The Drawings are amended as follows:

FIGS. 1 and 2 are amended to add the notation, "Prior Art."

FIG. 7 is amended to add the reference numeral 101.

Attachment: Replacement Drawing Sheet 1 including FIG. 1;  
Replacement Drawing Sheet 2 including FIG. 2; and  
Replacement Drawing Sheet 7 including FIG. 7.

PATENT  
450100-03060.1**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are currently pending. Claims 9-12 are hereby added. Claim 6 is hereby canceled. Claims 1, 7 and 8 are independent. Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

**II. OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Figures 1 and 2 are hereby amended to add the notation "Prior Art," as required in the Office Action.

Figure 7 is hereby amended to add the reference numeral 101 to the bus, as required in the Office Action. The bus is identified in the specification. Par. [0111] in the published application. No new matter has been added.

Replacement drawing sheets are included herein.

Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

PATENT  
450100-03060.1

### III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,835,888 to Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter, merely Kanevsky). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A speech recognition apparatus . . . comprising . . .

storing means to store a dictionary database having a standard dictionary area and an unknown word dictionary area . . .” (emphasis added).

As understood by Applicants, Kanevsky discloses a language model that includes splitting words into stems, prefixes and endings (column 2, lines 26-29). Also, Kanevsky proposes to calculate the probability of a word as a weighted sum of output probabilities of several language models (column 3, lines 10-14). However, Kanevsky does not teach or suggest that a dictionary database is divided into two separate regions; one region that contains standard words and another region that deals with unknown words.

In contrast claim 1 recites, “storing means to store a dictionary database having a standard dictionary area and an unknown word dictionary area.” (Emphasis added). Indeed, Kanevsky does not mention any method on how to deal with unknown words entered by a user. In the present invention, an unknown word received by the speech recognition apparatus is referred to the unknown word dictionary area of the dictionary database. The unknown word dictionary area can provide a most likely candidate for the unknown word. In turn, the most likely word then may be recognized in the standard dictionary area.

PATENT  
450100-03060.1

Claim 1 is patentable over Kanevsky because that reference does not disclose each and every element of the claim. In particular, Kanevsky does not disclose, "storing means to store a dictionary database having a standard dictionary area and an unknown word dictionary area" as recited in claim 1.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 7 and 8 are also believed to be patentable.

#### IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,771 to Muthusamy et al. (hereinafter, merely "Muthusamy"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

First, claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed herein above.

Second, Muthusamy does not teach or suggest the element recited in claim 5 that is missing from Kanevsky. In particular, Muthusamy does not teach or suggest "storing means to store a dictionary database having a standard dictionary area and an unknown word dictionary area."

Claim 5 is patentable over Kanevsky and Muthusamy because those references either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the claim as discussed herein above.